



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ARTICLE IV.

COLLATION OF A SECOND MANUSCRIPT OF THE ATHARVA-VEDA PRÂTIÇÂKHYA.

BY WILLIAM D. WHITNEY,
PROFESSOR OF SANSKRIT IN YALE COLLEGE.

Presented to the Society October 13th, 1871.

THE Atharva-Veda Prâtiçâkhyâ was published by me, with a translation and notes, founded mainly on the native comment, in the seventh volume of this Journal (1862). The edition was based upon a single manuscript, of a very incorrect and somewhat defective character, but the only one known to be in existence: and the publication was not made until after the failure of an attempt to obtain new manuscript material in India (as is explained in the introductory note to the work). Early last year, however, I was informed by Professor Weber of Berlin that Dr. George Bühler of Bombay had recently purchased on behalf of the Government of Bombay, along with other Atharvan material (see the complete list in the Monatsbericht of the Berlin Academy for February, 1871, pp. 76-7), a copy of this treatise; unfortunately, not accompanied by a commentary. I lost no time in sending to Dr. Bühler a request for a transcript of the new manuscript, and, by his kindness, I received the desired transcript, carefully verified by himself, in the course of the summer. The results of its collation are here presented.

The signature of the manuscript, giving the scribe's name, and the place and time of writing, is as follows:

*grāṇthasamkhyâ 180. pañcolināgajitsūnunā kanvālayanivāsina
bhavadevene 'daṁ grāṇtham likhitam; saṁ 1718 kâtṭikaçudi 11
budhe.*

The date is in the autumn, A. D. 1660.

The title of the treatise is everywhere given as *caturādhyâyikâ* simply, with no mention of Çaunaka. The ending of each of the four chapters is *âtharvane caturādhyâyikâyām prathamam* (etc.) *'dhyâyah;* and at the end of all is farther added, in more

extended phrase, *âtharvane saṁhitâlakṣaṇagrāṇthe caturâdhyâyikâvyākaraṇaṁ saṁpûrṇaṁ*. The endings of the sections are also marked in entirely uniform manner, *prathamasya prathamah pādah*, and so on. There is nowhere any trace of an enumeration of the rules.

The form of the name as before accepted by me is therefore established beyond the reach of question; and the responsibility for its inconsistency with grammatical rule is to be put upon the shoulders of its authors or transmitters, whose errors, if such there be, we are not called upon to amend in a matter of this kind.

The opening invocation, *om namaḥ ṛâbrahmavedâya*, is in close accordance with that of the other manuscript (see p. 575, or 245 of the separate impression).

I begin now a detailed collation, with statement of the results following from it. With this I incorporate, here and there, a few corrections, in great part derived from a notice and criticism of the former work given by Weber in the Literarisches Central-Blatt, No. 29 (1863), and reprinted by him in the second volume of his Indische Streifen (pp. 230–233). For the sake of brevity, I denote the new manuscript everywhere by B., and refer to the other as A.

After the invocation, already quoted, follows next *om athâ 'ṅgirasah*. This, then, is evidently the first rule of the treatise as at present constituted, and my conjecture (p. 575 [245]), that it was “a copyist’s error for *atharvâṅgirasah*,” and so a part of the invocation, is proved erroneous. Being, however, unexplained in the commentary (like the metrical and other appendages to the third and fourth chapters, to be noticed later), its right to stand as an original part of the treatise may be questioned. Its form, too, is suspicious: *athâ 'ṅgirasah* would be a proper heading for the Atharvan text itself, rather than for such a treatise as this. Nor do we expect a Prâtiçâkhyâ to begin with defining the text to which it relates; a mere *evam iha*, as in the next rule but one, is all the definition that is called for.

i.2. B. divides into two rules, by a line of interpunction inserted after *ca*. A. does the same in the final repetition of the rule. This is not an evidence of much consequence, as there are several cases later (namely i.94, ii.65, iv.96, 109) where B. blunderingly inserts a mark of division in the midst of a rule. The exposition of the whole as one connected rule by the comment in A. (though not unattended with difficulties) is of much more weight. The point would hardly be worth dwelling upon, save that the admission of *athâ 'ṅgirasah* as a rule seems to demand that, in order to make out the number of forty-one rules in the section, we throw rules 14–16 into one (see below), and then find one extra rule somewhere; and there would appear to be no other place to

find it than here. I will not undertake to decide the point absolutely.

i.4. B. has *anrkārah* . . . , as has A. also in every place but one, where it reads *annrkārah*. There can be no question that the amendment to *anrkārah* is a necessary one.

i.8. B. . . . *trtyāntān iti çau* : a mere copyist's error.

i.14-16. These are given in B. as a single rule, and should doubtless count as such. It was not quite correct to state that A. treated 12 and 13 together, as one rule; a renewed examination shows me that there has been, rather, a complete falling out of the comment to 12, so that 12 is stated, and then 13 explained and repeated. As to how the required number of rules shall be found in the chapter, see above, under rule 2.

i.19. B. . . . *adharakanthyah*; A. has the same in the rule and its final repetition, but *-thah* both times in the comment.

i.25. B. . . . *adharāushthyam*; A. has *-thyam* in rule, paraphrase, and repetition, but not in the interpretation.

i.30. B. . . . *antasthānām*; and so in every other like case hereafter (with an exception or two which will be noted in passing); A. has the same almost uniformly; I adopted the reading *antasthā* etc. because the rules of the Prātiçākhyā itself do not authorize the omission of *visarjaniya* before a sibilant followed by a surd mute.

i.33. This rule is probably to be understood as *eke 'sprshtam* (as suggested by F. M. Müller, Sanskrit Grammar, §57, note †). The commentary reads (a little amended) *eke 'sprshtam svarānān karanān bruvate, apare vivṛtam*. What, however, should be the difference between *aspr̥shtam* and *vivṛtam* except as a verbal question, of choice between synonyms, it is not easy to see. Possibly a difference in the implied degree of openness is to be recognized.

i.39. B. *salakāra lṛvarṇam*; A. everywhere *sabhakāraṇi*, followed by *nṛvarṇam*, *trv-*, and *mrv-*; that the true reading is that given in the edition is not, of course, to be questioned.

i.42. B. has, apparently, *-shtānaḥ* amended to *shthānaḥ*.

i.43. B. . . . *hīnaḥ çvāsanādaḥ* : doubtless an error of the scribe.

i.63. B. *shatparasor* . . . : an obvious blunder.

i.66. B., in fact, has . . . *aṅgurim*, which I pointed out as being undoubtedly the preferable reading.

i.68. B. *parosh-* : a scribe's error.

i.73. B. *dirgha pra-* : also doubtless an error of transcription.

It is to be noted that the Tāittirīya-Prātiçākhyā (at x.24) makes the same prescription as the others do respecting the exemption of a "*pragraha*" vowel from phonetic alteration.

i.74. B. *ikār*:- a mere slip of the pen.

i.77. B. *co 'dāttah*; and A. has the same reading. My reading *udāttāḥ* was, I think, a simple oversight; since the singular, used in a collective way, is obviously not less admissible than the plural.

i.82. B. *iti parah*, like A. I should, however, still defend the reading of the edition as a called-for emendation.

i.85. B. has *pāṇsumāṇs-* by first hand, but alters, erroneously, to *pāṇcu-*.

i.94-95. B. divides, erroneously, *soshmaṇi*: *pūrvasyā 'nāshmā 'ntaryeṇa vrttiḥ*.

In the edition, *'nushmā* is an error of the press for *'nāshmā*.

i.96. B. *khāimakhāz ity*: an oversight of the scribe.

i.98. B. *avavetāni*: a blunder merely.

i.99. B. *'nuttamā sp*:- also nothing more than a blunder.

I am inclined to think that the expression *yathāsamkhyam* in this rule distinctly implies the existence of four *yamas* only, and prescribes the insertion of them after the various mutes "in accordance with the number" of the latter: that is to say, of a first *yama* after a "first" mute, a second after a "second," and so on.

i.104. B. *pūrvah svar*-, which seems to me a false reading. I have no new light to cast upon the construction and meaning of this very obscure rule.

i.105. B., like A., runs all these extracts into *sandhi* together. It writes *srshtāḥ* and *prāçīḥ* (putting the figure after the *visar-janīya*); A. had dropped out the sign of protraction in these two words (as also that in *prāçiss*, where B. reads with the edition). It also has *avaçe 'ti*, without the sign, in accordance with what I had pointed out to be the requirement of rule 97. It adds a double stroke of interpunction after the *i* of *āsīd*, before the figure. Finally, along with A., it omits the *iti* after *tāsd* in the last citation; this I either admitted from the Atharvan text by an inadvertence, or inserted by way of an (unnecessary) emendation.

B. adds, as final rule of the chapter, *itu uttaram adhikam*, one of the phrases reported in the edition as constituting a part of the comment. There was nothing whatever in its appearance in A. to suggest the idea of its being a rule.

The full rehearsal of the cases of protraction in rule 105 is not in accordance with the general style of the treatise, which is wont to dispose of such a matter by a *gaṇa*, like *khanvakhāzī 'tyādi phutām*; and this circumstance, taken in connection with the peculiar mode of treatment of the two last rules by the commentator, is calculated to suggest the suspicion that whatever follows rule 104 is a later addition to the text. The Tāittirīya-Prātiçākhyā, at least, deems it no part of its duty to give a statement of the

protracted vowels of its text, and in the Vājasaneyi-Prātiçākhyā (ii.50-53) such a statement is made only incidentally.

ii.9. B. *śaṇanemaḥ* . . . : mere blunder.

ii.16. B. *śhakārāntān nānāp* : an equivalent reading.

ii.18. B. *lopo dañ sthāḥ stambhoḥ* . . . : the most blundering version of a rule that is to be found in the whole manuscript.

ii.22. B. *nakār* : slip of the copyist's pen.

ii.26. B. *nakārasya catatavargeshu* simply; and it has been pointed out already by Weber (in the review referred to above) that this is the true reading of A. also, I having allowed to blunder into the rule three words that in fact belonged to the comment. Of course, the inference which I drew in the note to the preceding rule from the repetition of *visarjanīyaḥ* in this one falls away as unfounded.

ii.47. B. . . . *rodviv* : error of copyist.

ii.58-59. B. runs these two rules together, and adds *ca* at the end. The *ca* may be a genuine difference of reading, but the rules must at any rate be separated, as no *na* is implied in the latter.

ii.61-62. B. again accidentally omits the pause between these two rules.

ii.65. B. puts a *virāma* under the *t* of *karat*, and adds a pause, thus dividing the rule into two; but it is an obvious blunder.

ii.73. B. has *pitush pi*-, which is the better reading; but it also gives erroneously *pitari*.

ii.75. B. *āyush pra* : again a preferable reading.

ii.77. B. *paridhish pa* : once more, as in the two preceding cases, the true reading, since the Prātiçākhyā ought by all means to follow its own prescriptions.

ii.82. B. . . . *sādrūpasya* : an equivalent reading.

ii.86. B. *str̥tasyasvapishu* : copyist's error.

ii.89. B., *pr. manu*, had *nārṇadenope*; but it is amended to an accordance with the edition.

ii.92. B., *pr. manu*, had . . . *akāravayadhāye* . . . , but is amended to *akāśya* (for *akārasya* ?) *vyavāye*.

ii.94. B. supports the peculiar expression *-mebhyo*.

ii.102. B. has in margin *pātha mṛçi*.

iii.3. B. *vyavadhāv* . . . : mere copyist's blunder.

iii.20. B. *ralope pūrvasya* : a real difference of reading; acceptable, but not necessary.

iii.27. B. *-padhā svare* : error of the scribe.

iii.28. The *lacuna* pointed out as existing here in A. turns out to have involved two rules, which B. gives thus:

chakāraç ca;

pippalyādishu pūrvāt.

In the former of these, there is doubtless continued implication of *svarāt*, and the rule teaches that *ch* is doubled, or changed to *cch*, after any vowel. To this no other restriction applies than that taught in rule 30; and that one, only in the combination *chy*. The corresponding rules in the other Prātiçākhyas are as follows. The Rik Prāt. (vi.1, r. 3, ccelxxx.) teaches that *ch* is doubled as well when it is not the first consonant of a group as when it is; while a couple of later rules (vi.3, r. 12-13, ccelxxxviii.-ix.) rehearse a number of exceptional cases in which the duplication does not occur. The Vāj. Prāt. (iv.24) prescribes the invariable insertion of *c* between *ch* and a preceding vowel, and excepts (iv.25) but three cases. The Tāitt.-Prāt. (xiv.8) prescribes the duplication only in certain specified cases.

The second rule declares that 'in *pippali* etc. there is duplication after the first vowel of the word.' The cases here contemplated, judging from the word taken as example, are of a wholly different character from the others to which the rules of duplication relate, being such as have a double letter as part of their original and proper orthography. I do not, therefore, think it at all worth while to look through the Atharvan text in order to pick out the other words which may have been included in the *gana*. In every occurrence of this particular word, it may be noticed in passing, a part of the Atharvan manuscripts read *pishpali*.

The next following rule is *na visarjanīyah*, and with it begins the rehearsal of exceptions.

The hope which I before expressed (p. 584 [254]), that the restoration of these lost rules would lessen somewhat the list of duplications, is not realized: not a single one of the consonant groups treated in the third additional note requires to have its form as there given modified; we have only to extend the simple letter *ch*, in a host of cases, to the group *cch*.

iii.33. B. . . . *prakṛtyāḥ*: a blunder only.

The Tāitt.-Prāt. also has a corresponding rule (x.24).

iii.39. B. . . . '*ntasthāḥ*'; and the omission of the *h* and the treatment of the word as a singular were an oversight on my part, since my copy of A. reads in the rule *-sthāḥ*, and in the comment *antasthā bhavānti*.

iii.53. B. . . . *pūrvapadāder* A. has the same reading in the rule, and *pūrvah* was my emendation, suggested partly by the apparent necessities of the case, partly by the paraphrase of the commentator, which runs *pūrvo bhavati: padāder akārasya*. I do not see how the desired meaning can be obtained without reading *pūrvah*; although, even then, the expression is very difficult and peculiar.

In the comment to this rule and to 55, we are doubtless to read, as Weber suggests, *te 'bruvan* for *te 'kravan*. The phrase, however, does not occur in the Atharvan text.

iii.54. B. has *prakṛtyāḥ* again, as in rule 33 above.

The passage introductory to the third section of this chapter, and which, in the edition, I treated as a part of the commentary, is found in B., as if belonging to the text. That it belongs to the text, however, as an original and proper part of it, is by no means to be believed; it is, rather (along with the two similar passages to be noted later), the interpolation of some reworker. This is evidenced both by its own character and by the fact that the comment takes no notice of it; it did not belong to the treatise which the commentator took in hand to explain. Rather than report various readings merely, I give the whole passage precisely as it stands in B.:

shad eva svaritajātāni lakṣaṇāni pratijānate :
pārvaṃpārvaṃ dr̥dhatarāṃ mradīyo yadyad uttaram.1.
abhinihitaḥ prakṛṣṭiḥ jātyaḥ kṣāipraḥ ca tāv ubhāu :
tāirovyañjanapādavṛttāḥ etat svaritamāṇḍalam.2.
sarvatīkṣho 'bhinihitaḥ tataḥ prakṛṣṭiḥ ucyate :
tato mṛdutarāu svārāu jātyaḥ kṣāipraḥ ca tāv ubhāu.3.
tato mṛdutarāḥ svāras tāirovyañjana ucyate :
pādavṛtto mṛdutarā itī svārabalābalam.4.
aparāḥ prāḥ : tāirovyañjanapādavṛttāu tulyavṛttī ity udāttaḥ
pārva paro 'nudāttaḥ svārīta saṃdhiḥ :

iii.55. B. *kārah* instead of *kāram*, which relieves the grammatical difficulty pointed out in the note.

iii.56. B., as everywhere else, *prakṛṣṭiḥ*, sometimes writing the *k* with *virāma*, sometimes combining it with the *ḥ*.

iii.59. B. *antapade* : an error of the scribe.

iii.60. B. supports A. in the reading *ukārasya*, but it cannot be otherwise than false.

iii.62. B. *-vyapetas* : a mere slip of the pen on the part of a copyist.

iii.65. B. again has *-prakṛṣṭiḥ*; also *anumātrānighāto*, which, as Weber has pointed out, is the true reading of A. also.

iii.71. B. *udāttaṃ udāttagrutih*. This, except the final *h*, is the true form of the rule, and deducible (as Weber shows) from A. also. In constructing the text, I overlooked the fact that, from 67 onward, the implied subject is *akṣharam*, not *svaraḥ*.

iii.73. *vidhah* had been added in the original of B. after the *ca* of this rule, but was struck out again.

The concluding remarks upon this section, like the introduction, are given in B. as part of the text, and I repeat them here in their form as B. presents them:

asvarāṇi vyañjanāni: svaravati 'ty ānyatareyāḥ. kim saṁdheḥ svaritam: pūrvarūpam ity ānyatareyāḥ: uttararūpam cāṅkhamitriḥ: kim aksharasya svaryamāṇasya svaryate. ardham hrasvasya pādo dīrghasye 'ty eke: sarvam iti cāṅkhamitriḥ: aksharasya 'śhā vidhānam vidyate yad visvaribhāvah: rgarāddharceapadāntāvagrahavivṛttishu mātṛā kālāḥ. Weber notes that *visvaribhāva* is the reading in A.

iii.80. The *lacuna* in A. after this rule proves to be of nearly the dimensions that I conjectured; it includes, namely, five rules, which are given in B. as follows:

naṣaḥ ca;
dhātusthād ayakārāt;
uru;
brahmanvatyādinām;
nipātasya svah.

The form of these rules is in part very questionable, nor do I find it possible to make them fit the phenomena presented by the Atharvan text.

The first rule, *naṣaḥ ca*, must mean 'the *n* of *naḥ* also is changed to *ṇ* after *pra* and *parā*.' So far as *pra* is concerned, this is well enough; the cases of *pra naḥ* are twelve in the Atharvan; they are all mentioned in the note to rule 80. But the text offers no example of *naḥ* after *parā*; while, on the other hand, there are eight cases (counting xii.3.55-60 as but a single case) in which *naḥ* follows *pari* and is changed to *ṇaḥ*, all the manuscripts agreeing. The form of rule 80, then, as here implied, needs absolutely to have been *praparibhyām*, instead of *praparābhyām*. How to get over the difficulty I do not see. We cannot amend rule 80 to *praparibhyām*, because there is in the Atharvan a single case of *en* after *parā*, and a single phrase (repeated) in which it remains *en* after *pari*; both are quoted by the commentator under rule 80.

Of the remaining rules, one, *brahmanvatyādinām*, is clear enough in its bearing; it applies to the cases (referred to also in iv.99, and there rehearsed in the note) in which, against iii.89, a *n* becomes *ṇ* (in *pada* as well as *saṁhitā* text) even when final.

The other three have the aspect of representing the three items of a rule of Pāṇini, *naḥ ca dhātustho 'ru-shubhyah* (viii.4.27), and of having had their form determined rather by that principle of general grammar than by the requirements of the Atharvan text. To the form of the last of the three, indeed, great exception is to be taken. It appears capable of meaning only 'of the particle *su*,' while it ought to mean 'after *shu*, when a particle,' and so to read *nipātāt shvah*. If the particle *su* in its unaltered form were given in the rule, it ought to be represented by *suṇ*, as once before (ii.97); and in that case *suṇaḥ* would be enough of itself to constitute the rule; while if (as is obviously preferable) the altered form be taken, and written as *shvah*, the added qualification *nipātāt* would be needed, to exclude the case-ending *shu* in *grheshu naḥ*, and any other similar case that might occur. There is then the further

and not unimportant objection that no example of *n* for *n* after *shu* is to be found in the text. The altered *shu* is not once followed by *nah*; the only initial *n* that comes in contact with it is at xviii.1.37, where we have *stusha ū shu nrtamāya* (R. V. viii.24.1, *stusha ū shu vo nrtamāya*), not a single manuscript reading *nrtamāya*. Unless, therefore, all the manuscripts are wrong here, and we have to alter to *nrtamāya*, I cannot see what purpose this rule answers. In the Rig-Veda, it is to be observed, *shu* has an altering effect only on *nah* (R. Pr. v.26); but the putting of the precept here in question after *brahmaṇvatyādīnām* in our Prātiçākhyā seems to dissociate it from *nah*, and mark it as applying to any word whatever with initial *n*. A number of illustrative cases are given in the comment to Pāṇini, all of them taken from the Rig-Veda, and falling under the rule of its Prātiçākhyā already referred to. In the same comment is given as counter-example *gr̥sheshu nah*, the phrase which (as noted under rule 80 of the Prātiçākhyā) occurs twice in the Atharvan, most of the manuscripts reading each time *nah*. I think that, in view of the absence of authority for this reading in the Prātiçākhyā, the adoption of *nah* in the edited text is to be approved.

The rule *uru* affords fewer difficulties of interpretation. But the only passage in which *nah*, or any other word beginning with *n*, follows *uru*, is *uru nah kṛṇota* (v.3.6), where P. M., to be sure, have *nah*, but E. I. H. read *nah*, which was received into the edited text, because the passage is found also in the Rig-Veda, and is expressly exempted by the Rik Prāt. (v.27) from the operation of the rule requiring in general *nah* after *uru* (v.26). If this rule of our own treatise is to be respected, the correct Atharvan reading is *uru nah*. Possibly *urānasāu* (xviii.2.13), which I had regarded as included in the *gana* of rule 76, is to be brought under the present precept.

There remains the rule *dhātusthād ayakārāt*, which can hardly signify anything else than 'after an altering letter contained in a root, unless combined with *y*,' and must be understood as applying only to *nah*. But the only case of altered *n* in the text falling under the rule as thus understood is *gikshā no asmin* (xviii.3.67: the passage is also found at R. V. vii.32.26, and falls under one of the specifications of R. Pr. v.26, but one that is quite otherwise constructed than in our treatise): all the manuscripts read *no*. But the specification *ayakārāt*, if I interpret it correctly, can only be intended to exclude *urushya* (vi.4.3); and there all the *sanhitā* MSS. save E. give *urushyā nah*, which has accordingly been received into the edited text. And, on the other hand, we have *mīmṛsho nah* at iii.15.4, and *rīrisho nah* at xi.2.29, in which *n* is not read by a single manuscript. And these are all the cases occurring in the text to which the specification *dhātustha* applies.

It will have been made plain by this discussion how radical and even irreconcilable a discordance exists between the facts of the text as we have it and the rules of the Prātiçākhyā, upon this particular point. Considering the state of things, we must greatly

regret that we have not the native comment on the rules, that we might see how the commentator would deal with the difficulties involved. In order to cast any possible additional light upon them, I will here state, more fully than was done in the former note on iii.80, what the manuscripts do in various cases offered by the Atharvan text.

The reading *āçir nah* was received into the edited text at ii.29.3, because it was found in all the manuscripts without exception. But it is questionable whether this was anything more than an accidental agreement in error. There are thirty-four other similar cases in the text, where *nah* is preceded by a *r* altered from the final *s* of a form of declension, though no other in which the *r* represents a *s* that belongs to the radical part of the word; among these, H. reads *arātir nah* at ii.7.4, and P. M. W. have *senānir nah* at iv.31.2. Further, H. has *pitre nah* at i.31.4, and E. H. have *sarve nah* at v.7.6; H. has *atra nah* at vi.104.2. Of the two cases of *gr̥heshu nah* I have already spoken. If (as I do not at all suppose to be the case) the term *dhātustha* required to be understood as applying to an altering letter contained in the radical part of a noun-derivative, so that it would authorize *āçir nah*, then the following cases would also fall under it: *dvisho nah* (iv.33.7), *vāiçvānaro nah* (vi.35.1,2; 53.2; 119.1), *rayim nah* (vii.20.4; 79.1), *kshayāya nah* (vii.26.3), *ushā nah* (vii.69.1; also xix.48.2; 50.7), *viçvarūpo nah* (ix.4.22), *adhyaksho nah* (x.1.6), and, in the nineteenth book, *pūshā nah* (xix.10.9). No manuscript reads *n* in any of these passages.

There are a few such cases as *pari pāhi nah* (vii.84.1), but these are to be excluded from the operation of the rules by a reasonable understanding of the terms of the latter, as prescribing alteration only in words immediately following that containing the altering cause, without intervention of other words.

iii.81. The reading of this rule is in fact *punar nayāmasi*, as restored by conjecture in the edition.

iii.83. B. *durayānah*: a blunder merely.

iii.86. The corruption of A. at this point was greater than I imagined, and B. gives three rules between our 85 and 87, namely:
pra minanti;
na minanti;
nabheh.

Of the last of these, A. also has preserved a remnant, reading *nabheh* instead of *bhānoç ca* as the first statement of rule 87; but as there immediately followed a comment on *bhānoç*, with *bhānoç ca* repeated at the end, I regarded *nabheh* as merely a copyist's error. In this I doubtless showed a want of acuteness; yet, I hope, only to an excusable degree; for, although the forms *pra nabhasva* and *pra nabhatām* (vii.18.1,2) needed to be exempted from the operation of rule 79, above, I regarded them as included in the *gana* of rule 92, where they would be not less in place than the forms of *nart* with *pari* which are, according to the commentator, actually contemplated there.

The other two rules are attended with much greater difficulty. The facts in the text to which they must be meant to apply are fully stated in the note to rule 86; we have *pra mināti*, *pra minanti*, and *pra minit*, each once only, besides *pramināma* in the nineteenth book (with which the *Prātiṣākhya* does not concern itself). All these would be sufficiently provided for by a single rule, *na mināteh*, letting the third person singular present, as so often elsewhere, represent the root of which it is a form. We can, indeed, make shift to get along with *na minanti*, since the third plural might, in an exceptional way, be used as representative of the verb (there appears to be one other such case, at iv.39; see below), and it might be irregularly left uninflected though used in a genitive relation. But what to do with *pra minanti* besides I do not see, unless we may simply regard it as a blundering repetition of the other rule; and this is a very daring thing to do, as regards a manuscript so careful and generally accurate as B. Here, again, we must greatly regret our deprivation of the aid which the comment would give us in explaining the apparent anomalies of the text.

It was noted under rule 86 that A. also reads *na minanti*.

iii.89. B. *padāntāt parç-*; a mere blunder, so far as I can see. We might be glad to amend the rule to *padāntasparçayuktayoḥ* or *padānte sparçayuktasya ca*, but the ablative *padāntāt* is wholly unmanageable.

iii.93. B. . . . *ṣaṣhalāiḥ*: copyist's error.

iii.95. B. *padenā* "varjitenā, which is doubtless the true reading.

The long introductory passage at the head of the fourth chapter, given in full in the fourth additional note to the edition (p. 591 [261] ff.), is found in B. as part of the text of the chapter. I reproduce it here, precisely as read in the manuscript (but prefixing to the verses the same numbers as in the note referred to).

om samāsāvagrahavigrahān pade yatho 'vāca chāṇḍasi ṣākatāyanah: tathā pravakshyāmi catusṭayaṁ padam nāmā-khyātopasarganipātānām.

1. *ākhyātaṁ yat kriyāvāci nāma satvākhyam ucyate :
nīpātāṣ cādayo satva upasargās tu prādayaḥ.*
2. *nāma nāmnam udāttena samastaṁ prakṛtisvaram.
na yushmadasmadvacanāni na cā "mañtritam iṣhyate :*
3. *nāmā 'nudāttam prakṛtisvaro gatir
anucco vā nāma cet syād udāttum.*

kriyāyoge: gatipūrvah samāso

yāvañto 'nuccāḥ samarthās tān samasyet :

4. *yatrā 'neko 'py anucco 'sti paraṣ ca prakṛtisvaraḥ :
ākhyātaṁ nāma vā yat syāt sarvaṁ eva samasyate.*
5. *sopasargaṁ tu yan nīcāḥ pūrvam vā yadi vā 'param.
udāttena samasyante yathāi 'tat supratishṭhitam.*
6. *udāttas tu nīpāto yah so 'nudāttah kvacid bhavet.
samasyate yathāvidham itihāso nidarṣanam :*

7. *naghârishâm sasahe 'ty evamâdîny udâharet : sahe 'ty enâ 'nudâttaim param nâma samasyate.*
8. *anudâttena co 'dâttaim abhâvo yatra co 'cyate : sahasûktavâkah sântarddeçâh çatakrato nidarçanam.*
10. *anudâtto 'nugatir yatrâ 'nudâttaim param padam : pûrvana vîgrahas tatra sam subhûtyâ nidarçanam.*
11. *yatro 'bhe da prakrtisvare pûrvam yac ca param ca yat : varjyayitvâ "dyudâtânî sarvam eva vîgrhyate :*
12. *nâmâkhyâtânî samasyante na câ "khyâtâim ca nâma ca : nâma nâmno 'pasargâis tu sambandhârthan samasyate.*
13. *na yushmadasmadâideçâ anudâtât padât pare : nâmopasargagatibhih samasyante kadâ cana :*
14. *mâm anu pra te putram ity evamâdîny udâharet : etadaç câ 'nudâtânî 'damaç ca tathâi 'va ca :*
15. *nâmopasargagatibhih samasyante kadâ cana : brhann eshâm ya enâm vanim âyanti pary enân pary asye 'ti nidaçanam :*
9. *anudâtto 'nugatir madhye pûrvaparâu prakrtihsvarâu pûrvana vîgrahas tatra purushe 'dhi samâhite :*
16. *anudâtto 'nugatih sarvâih samasta svaritâdâibhih : sañsrâvyena nir durarmanya âcârye 'ti nidarçanam :*
17. *pra-parâ-ni-sam-â-nir-dur-avâ-'dhi-pari-vi 'ti ca : aty-api-sâ-'d-apâ-'bhî 'ty upâ-'nu-prati viñcati :*
18. *ekâksharâ udâtâ âdyudâtâs tathâ 'pare : abhi 'ty ânta upasargâh kriyâyoge gatis tathâ :*
19. *âdyudâtâ daçai 'teshâm uccâ ekâksharâ nava : viñcater upasargânâm ântodâtâs tv abhi 'ty ayam :*
20. *achâ-ram-astam-hasto-lângûlam-tirah-purah-punar-navah-çyenî-vâti-phalâ-hin-srag-vashâ-rulâ-kakajâ-svâhâ-svadhâ-çrat-svaralulâ ity upasarga-vṛttîni yathânamnâtaḥ svarâni.*

The variations of reading here presented are in hardly any instance of a nature to throw further light upon the meaning of the passages in which they occur; and I think it accordingly superfluous to enter into any new discussion of the extract. That it forms no proper part of the substance of the Prâtiçâkhyâ is sufficiently obvious.

iv.3. B. *anarthakakarm-*; and this is probably the true reading in A. also, as the commentary has *anarthakâiç ca karmappravacanî-yâiç ca* etc.

iv.6. B. ... *phutaḥ svarasyâ 'siddhatvât*; and A. also has *phutaḥ, phutasvarasya* being my own conjectural emendation, and one to which I should be inclined still to adhere: at least, I do not see how to construe *phutaḥ*. But *asiddhatvât* is probably correct, and is to be understood as having the virtual meaning of 'anomalousness.'

iv.12. B. reads distinctly *anîngena*, thus refusing its support to Weber's conjecture of *alîngena*. I have no new light to cast upon the interpretation of the rule.

iv.16. B. reads plainly *taratamayoh*, not *-poh*.

iv.18. Weber conjectures, in the commentary, in place of *viñño*, the reading *vineh*, i. e. 'of the *taddhita*-ending *vin*.'

iv.20. B. *tátaye*: a real and rather surprising difference of reading. I cannot now tell whether *tátaye* would cover all the cases that occur in the Atharvan text, but know nothing to the contrary. We have *tátibhih* more than once, but that is differently divided, *táti-bhih*, by iv.31.

iv.21. B. *ubhayā[d] dyusi*: doubtless the true reading.

iv.29. B. has, erroneously, *svasvarāt*, instead of *svarāt*; also *tanvāni*, but amended to *tanmāni*. Respecting the latter word, see the St. Petersburg lexicon, under *māni*.

iv.36. B. has '*paspr̥ṣhte* 'pi, as also A. in the rule, but *-sr̥ṣhte* in the comment. If *upaspr̥ṣhte* is the actual reading of the treatise, it can hardly be anything but a corruption of *upasr̥ṣhte*, which is plainly used as equivalent to *upasargayukte*.

iv.39. B. *ananta*; and A. has the same in the commentary and repetition. Probably, then, this is the true reading, and we have here a second instance (as in iii.86) of the adoption of a third person plural instead of singular as representative of the root.

iv.44. B. . . . *vā 'vagr̥hye*: doubtless a blunder merely.

iv.46. B. *subhishaktame*: also, I presume, an error of the copyist.

iv.53. B. does not divide this meḍley; and it reads *pūrvasu* for *parvasu*.

iv.56. B., by a slip of the pen, *avarṇātenāi*

iv.61. B. omits *ca*: a better reading.

iv.62. B. *udā* for *udo*; and so also A. in the rule, but *udaḥ* in the commentary. I do not see how we can help accepting *udo*.

iv.66-7. B. omits the mark of division between these two rules, but doubtless only by an oversight. The *lacuna* in A. makes its evidence a little less valuable, perhaps; yet I can hardly question that the rules are correctly divided in the edition.

iv.69. B. reads *dr̥ci* instead of *dr̥ṣau*, as does A. also in the rule and its repetition. I altered the reading to *dr̥ṣau*, to accord with *vyadhāu* and *sahāu* in the preceding and following rules, on the authority of the comment, which has *dr̥ṣāu ca sarvaṇmānā akā-rāntena ikārāntena ca*. B. has, by accidental omission, *-rānte* at the end.

iv.73. B. *prakrtir darg*: a blunder merely.

Overlooking, it may be remarked in passing, the definition and use of *samāpatti* and the kindred word *samāpādya* in our treatise, Professor Müller has failed to comprehend the latter as met with in the Rik Prātiçākhyā (xiii.11,12).

iv.74. B. *shatvanatvopacāradīrghatutvalopātpadānām*
Upacāra is doubtless an error of transcription; and *ātpadānām*, although A. has distinctly the same reading, cannot be anything else.

iv.86. B. reads also, with the utmost distinctness, . . . *anah-vānām*. Weber acutely suggests emendation to *anatkānām*, 'being without augment' (*at* being the Paninean designation for the augment), and I can hardly doubt that the latter is the true reading.

iv.93. B. at end *glapīnām*, which would probably have been the reading of A. also, but for the corrupt condition of the text along here.

The words *ingyavac ca* are in fact found in B. as the next rule; but, in the absence of a comment and illustrations to show what is the meaning, I do not venture to attempt the interpretation of a phrase so indefinite.

iv.96. B. has . . . *kesaraprābandhāyām*, with *virāma* under the final *m*, and a pause added, thus dividing the rule into two; in both respects, evidently in the wrong.

iv.98. B. *-shu tripadatvāt*: doubtless the true reading. Weber points out that it is to be plausibly inferred from A. also.

iv.100. B. *-tvāyādīnām ca*: probably the true reading.

The restoration of *ingyavac ca* (after rule 93), and the reckoning of the introduction to the chapter as a rule, would make out the number 102, given in A. as that of the rules in the first three sections.

iv.107, comment (p. 565 [235], l. 22). Read *tānasvarena*, 'with prolonged tone' (as pointed out by Weber, Ind. Stud. x.432).

iv.108. My solution of the difficulty here was not quite the right one. The present rule stands as I gave it; but there is found before it another, namely *samhitādārdhyārtham* (B. has in both rules *-dādhy-*), which is an additional specification to the preceding rule, and which we have reason to be surprised at not finding pointed out as such by an added *ca*: 'and for the sake of fixing the *samhitā*-reading.' The presence of *ca* would have made evident the value of the phrase as a rule; although it must be confessed that I ought (notwithstanding the imperfection at this point of the prefixed body of rules, which gives for both the rules together only *samhitāpadapadādhyārtham*) to have been acute enough to infer that value for it as things actually were. The rules and comment read in A. as follows (somewhat amended):

samhitādārdhyārtham: *samhitāddārdhyārtham ca padāny adhyeyāni*: *dr̥ghasya bhāvo dārdhyam*: *varnadṛghādibhyah shyañ ca*: *tatra padādhyāyī samhitāyām samdeha utpanne sam-gayachedanam kuryāt. yadi padādhyayanena samdehāpanayo bhavati tarhi kin kramādhyayanena*: *tatrā "ha*:

kramādhyayanam saṁhitāpadaḍārḍhyārtham: saṁhītā ca svasaṁsthā ca bhavati:

and so on, as given in the edition.

iv.109. B. has *cā 'ddrshṭaḥ*, and adds a double pause, breaking the rule into two: an obvious error.

iv.112. B. *nā 'ntargatam* : a blunder.

iv.117. B. *-samāpadyāntargatānām* : both the variations of reading from the edited text being evidently erroneous.

It is made sufficiently plain, I think, in the note on this rule, that my pronouncing the Atharvan *krama* a more complete index of the irregularities of its text than is that of the Rik depends upon the suggested understanding of the term *samāpādya*, as applying to all words which require a restoration of natural form in any of the respects mentioned in iv.74, without the restriction, laid down in Rik Prāt. x.7, to those whose alteration is *ananyakārīta*, 'not having its cause in another word.' Whether *samāpādya* actually has so wide a meaning is another question, which I admit to be doubtful. It is easy, by leaving out of sight the difficulties that beset the interpretation of rule 74 and its successors, to render a facile decision as to what is there signified. Doubtless, if we had a *krama*-text which we knew to be constructed according to the directions of our Prātiśākhya, we should be able to make the former explain the latter. But, as things are, a renewed careful study of the rules and their bearings, while it has made me less certain as to some of the conclusions which I before reached, has not brought me to so assured a solution of the difficulties involved that I think it worth while to discuss the subject here anew.

iv.122. B. *-tra pras-*: without doubt, an error, although A. has once the same reading in the commentary.

iv.123. It would be easy, by understanding *pragṛhyāvagṛhya* in this rule as a copulative instead of a determinative compound, meaning '*pragṛhyas* and *divisibles*' rather than '*pragṛhya* *divisibles*,' to make it teach nearly the same extent of repetition in *pada*-text as appears in the Yajur-Veda, and as was conjectured above (under rule 74) for the Atharvan also. Yet it is possible so to understand rules 74-6 as to make them imply a *pada*-text like that found in the manuscripts. Rule 74, namely, would, so far as the *pada* was concerned, teach restoration only in *dustano iti duh-tano* and the few other cases rehearsed on page 552 [222]; while rule 75 would apply to such *pada* words as *nī-secanam*, meaning 'even where there is no repetition, the same reversal of the specified alterations is made, when these occur in the latter member of a compound as effects of a cause contained in the former member;' and rule 76 would add the farther restriction that the words so treated must be not merely theoretically divisible, but divided in the actual usage of the *pada*-text.

iv.126. B. repeats *parihāryaḥ ca*, to signify the conclusion of the treatise.

As I have noticed and reported the various corrections and conjectures made by Weber in respect to matters of detail, in his valuable notice of the Prâtîcâkhyâ, I will say a word or two here also upon points of a more general character in that notice.

Weber says: "Between *bâhlika*, 'of Balkh,' and *valhika*, from the root *valh*, there is doubtless a distinction to be made. Both words may well enough have existed side by side, but have then been variously confounded with one another." These remarks are not quite intelligible to me. In the three passages where the word occurs in the Atharvan text, it is plainly a geographical name, and doubtless designates 'them of Balkh;' it was, therefore, a matter of interest that the Prâtîcâkhyâ proved *bâhlika*, and not *bahlika*, to mean 'of Balkh;' thus tending to show that the latter form of the word, wherever met with, is a mere orthographical blunder. The St. Petersburg lexicon, it may be added, takes my view of the matter, and knows nothing of any word *valhika* from *valh*.

My objection to recognizing the Atharva Prâtîcâkhyâ as demonstrably the most modern of the treatises of its class was only that I did not consider the fact quite so satisfactorily demonstrated as some had been inclined to claim. Against the conclusion itself, as a matter of sentiment, I have not the least objection; but would only guard against an undue estimate of the force and conclusiveness of the evidence bearing upon the point.

Weber pronounces it "completely impracticable" (*völlig unthunlich*), in attempting to determine the relation of the Prâtîcâkhyâ to the existing Atharvan text, to combine the citations of the commentary with those of the Prâtîcâkhyâ itself. To me it still seems quite impracticable to do otherwise. There is no possibility, in the case of any of these treatises, of reaching a precise and absolute conclusion in regard to such a point, because the Prâtîcâkhyâ does not in general cite passages, but rather determines principles and instances words. But in the present treatise especially, where the rules often give only the initial word of a list, the case is even more hopeless than elsewhere: to test the text by the Prâtîcâkhyâ alone would lead to no result that was worth deriving or stating; we have to choose between nothing at all and a conclusion which, being founded on both treatise and commentary, is liable to the uncertainties arising from the introduction of an uncertain element—everywhere, of course, avoiding the assertion respecting the treatise itself of anything which really depends on the comment: as I was careful to do. In the reprint of his notice, Weber allows in an added note that "in the indexes" the text and commentary are sufficiently distinguished: which evidently implies that elsewhere there are instances of their confusion. In this, however, he does me injustice: any one who will take the trouble to look carefully through the second additional note will find that there is not there made a single statement or item of statement in which the two are not held distinctly apart.